

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the application. Applicants have canceled claim 2, and amended claims 1 and 10. Applicants request reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The specification has been objected to for containing informalities. Applicants have amended the specification to address the Examiner's concerns by making the changes suggested. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 1, 3-16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,992,111 to Waterhouse (hereafter "Waterhouse"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and request reconsideration of the claims.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 2 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." The limitations of claim 2 have been added to claim 1 which is the independent claim on which claim 2 depended. Claim 1 is therefore now allowable over Waterhouse. Claim 2 has been canceled.

Dependant claims 3-9 are allowable over Waterhouse, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 1.

Claim 10 recites “wherein at least one of the first and second opposing facing strips is removably coupled to the spacer web portion, the removably coupled facing strip coupling to the spacer web portion by inserting the removably coupled facing strip into a narrow receptacle in the spacer web portion.” Waterhouse does not teach a removably coupled facing strip that is coupled to the spacer web portion “by inserting the removably coupled facing strip into a narrow receptacle in the spacer web portion”. Instead Waterhouse teaches removably coupled facing strips which contain a receptacle 37b into which the spacer web portion 33 is inserted.(FIG 5A). The difference though subtle is very important in the operation of the internal framework of the present invention. With Waterhouse’s configuration the glass blocks press in on the spacer web portion 33 making sliding or rotating the facing strips 37b into place very difficult as they must be squeezed between the glass blocks. The present invention, however, may eliminate this problem by placing the receptacle in the spacer web portion which keeps the glass blocks separated and allows the removably coupled facing strips to be easily inserted. Therefore, claim 10 is allowable over Waterhouse.

Dependant claims 11-20 are allowable over Waterhouse, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 10.

Claims 21-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,042,210 to Taylor (hereafter “Taylor”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration of the claims.

Claim 21 recites “applying an adhesive sealant to the formed portion of the at least one internal compartment; latitudinally inserting at least one glass block into the formed portion of the at least one internal compartment from a front of the glass block panel system”. The Taylor patent, however, does not disclose "applying an adhesive sealant to the formed portion of the at least one internal compartment" and then "latitudinally inserting at least one glass block into the formed portion of the at least one internal compartment" as described in

claim 21. Instead, Taylor discloses "applying caulking about the outer edges of each block in the intervening space between the in-place blocks and the frame packet." (Col. 2, lines 44-46). In fact, Taylor actually teaches against applying adhesive before the glass blocks are in place. (Col. 2, lines 52-54). Therefore, Claim 21 is allowable over Taylor.

Dependant claims 22-27 are allowable over Waterhouse, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 21.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated the allowability of the scope and subject matter of claims 2 & 17, but objected to the form of the claims, they being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. The format of claim 1 has been amended herein without changing its scope to incorporate the elements of the respective base claims upon which they depend and all intervening claims, and are therefore allowable.

Regarding Doctrine of Equivalents

Applicants hereby declare that any amendments herein that are not specifically made for the purpose of patentability are made for other purposes, such as clarification, and that no such changes shall be construed as limiting the scope of the claims or the application of the Doctrine of Equivalents.